

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM RAY COLLINS, # 56532

PETITIONER

v.

CIVIL NO. 1:24cv339-HSO-RPM

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

RESPONDENT

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This matter is before the Court sua sponte. Pro se Petitioner William Ray Collins filed this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [1] under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging his August 31, 2000, armed robbery conviction from the Circuit Court of Harrison County, Mississippi. [1] at 1. Collins is incarcerated with the Mississippi Department of Corrections. The Court has considered and liberally construed the pleadings and finds that this case should be dismissed.

Collins alleges that the initial indictment was defective and that the state court was without authority to amend it, [2] at 8, 10, such that his conviction is void, *id.* at 12. This, however, is not the first time Collins has filed a habeas petition challenging this conviction. *Collins v. Hood*, 1:15cv282 (S.D. Miss. Sep. 17, 2015); *Collins v. Shaw*, 1:14cv161 (S.D. Miss. May 12, 2014); *Collins v. Banks*, 1:10cv312 (S.D. Miss. Jul. 19, 2010); *Collins v. Kelly*, 1:09cv271 (S.D. Miss. Apr. 23, 2009); *Collins v. Waller*, 1:03cv304 (S.D. Miss. Mar. 5, 2004). After Collins's fifth such habeas petition, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals sanctioned him \$100 and ordered that he is, "BARRED from filing, . . . in any court subject to this court's

jurisdiction, any challenge to his armed robbery conviction and sentence until the sanction is paid in full, unless he first obtains leave of the court in which he seeks to file such challenge.” *In re Collins*, 15-60654 (5th Cir. Nov. 18, 2015).

Collins once again contests his Harrison County armed robbery conviction, but he has failed to show that he has satisfied the Fifth Circuit’s sanction or demonstrate that he obtained leave of this Court prior to filing the Petition. Collins is precluded from filing the instant challenge to his armed robbery conviction; therefore, this case must be dismissed.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that, this civil action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. A separate final judgment shall issue pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58.

SO ORDERED, this the 7th day of April, 2025.

s/ Halil Suleyman Ozerden

HALIL SULEYMAN OZERDEN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE